

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
MEMPHIS DIVISION**

DAVID HASLETT,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO.:

v.

SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC.,

Defendant.

---

**COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, DAVID HASLETT, by and through the undersigned counsel, and sues Defendant, SANTANDER CONSUMER USA, INC., and in support thereof respectfully alleges violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”).

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The TCPA was enacted to prevent companies like SANTANDER CONSUMER USA, INC. from invading American citizen’s privacy and to prevent abusive “robo-calls.”

2. “The TCPA is designed to protect individual consumers from receiving intrusive and unwanted telephone calls.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

3. “Senator Hollings, the TCPA’s sponsor, described these calls as ‘the scourge of modern civilization, they wake us up in the morning; they interrupt our dinner at night; they force the sick and elderly out of bed; they hound us until we want to rip the telephone out of the wall.’ 137 Cong. Rec. 30, 821 (1991). Senator Hollings presumably intended to give telephone subscribers another option: telling the autodialers to simply stop calling.” *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F. 3d 1242 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

4. According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), “Unwanted calls are far and away the biggest consumer complaint to the FCC with over 200,000 complaints each year – around 60 percent of all the complaints....Some private analyses estimate that U.S. consumers received approximately 2.4 billion robocalls per month in 2016.” <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/fcc-initiatives/fccs-push-combat-robocalls-spoofing>

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. Jurisdiction and venue for purposes of this action are appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, Federal Question Jurisdiction, as this action involves violations of the TCPA.

6. Subject matter jurisdiction, federal question jurisdiction, for purposes of this action is appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States; and this action involves violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). See *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, S.Ct. 740, 748 (2012) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242, 1249 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

7. The alleged violations described herein occurred in Shelby County, Tennessee. Accordingly, venue is appropriate with this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2), as it is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Plaintiff is a natural person, and citizen of the State of Tennessee, residing in Shelby County.

9. Plaintiff is the “called party.” See *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 755 F. 3d 1265 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

10. Defendant is a corporation with its principal place of business located at 1601 Elm Street, Suite 800, Dallas, Texas 75201 and which conducts business in the State of Tennessee through its registered agent, C T Corporation System located at 300 Montvue Road, Knoxville, Tennessee 37919.

11. Defendant called Plaintiff approximately four hundred (400) times in an attempt to collect an alleged debt. Due to the amount of calls, Plaintiff was unable to properly catalogue every call and thus a more accurate number of calls will be identified after a thorough review of Defendant's records and Plaintiff's cellular telephone records.

12. Some or all of the calls Defendant made to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number were made using an "automatic telephone dialing system" which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator (including but not limited to a predictive dialer) or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and to dial such numbers as specified by 47 U.S.C § 227(a)(1) (hereinafter "autodialer calls"). Plaintiff will testify that he knew it was an autodialer because of the vast number of calls he received and because he heard a pause when he answered his phone before a voice came on the line.

13. Plaintiff believes the calls were made using equipment which has the capacity to store numbers to be called and to dial such numbers automatically.

14. Plaintiff is the subscriber, regular user and carrier of the cellular telephone number (901) \*\*\*-9814 and was the called party and recipient of Defendant's calls.

15. Defendant placed an exorbitant number of calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone (901) \*\*\*-9814 in an attempt to collect on an alleged debt.

16. On several occasions over the last four (4) years, Plaintiff instructed Defendant's agent(s) to stop calling his cellular telephone.

17. In or about July of 2018, Plaintiff communicated with Defendant from his aforementioned cellular telephone number and instructed Defendant's agent to cease calling. Plaintiff demanded Defendant's only reach him via email or in writing and stop calling his aforementioned cellular telephone number.

18. During the aforementioned call with Defendant's agent in or about July of 2018, Plaintiff unequivocally revoked any express consent Defendant may have believed they had for placement of telephone calls to Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice.

19. Each subsequent call Defendant made to the Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number was made without the "express consent" of the Plaintiff.

20. Each subsequent call Defendant made to the Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number was knowing and willful.

21. Despite actual knowledge of its wrongdoing, Defendant continued the campaign of abuse, calling Plaintiff despite Plaintiff revoking any express consent Defendant may have believed it had to call his aforementioned cellular telephone number.

22. Plaintiff's requests for the harassment to end were in vain as Defendant continues to call Plaintiff.

23. Defendant has a corporate policy to use an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice to individuals just as they did to Plaintiff's cellular telephone in this case.

24. Defendant has a corporate policy to use an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice, just as they did to the Plaintiff's cellular telephone in this case, with no way for the consumer, or Defendant, to remove the number.

25. Defendant's corporate policy is structured so as to continue to call individuals like Plaintiff, despite these individuals explaining to Defendant they do not wish to be called.

26. Defendant has numerous other federal lawsuits pending against them alleging similar violations as stated in this Complaint.

27. Defendant has numerous complaints against it across the country asserting that its automatic telephone dialing system continues to call despite being requested to stop.

28. Defendant has had numerous complaints against it from consumers across the country asking to not be called, however Defendant continues to call these individuals.

29. Defendant's corporate policy provided no means for Plaintiff to have Plaintiff's number removed from Defendant call list.

30. Defendant has a corporate policy to harass and abuse individuals despite actual knowledge the called parties do not wish to be called.

31. Not one of Defendant's telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were for "emergency purposes" as specified in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

32. Defendant willfully and/or knowingly violated the TCPA with respect to Plaintiff.

33. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of invasion of privacy and the intrusion upon his right of seclusion.

34. From each and every call without express consent placed by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of the occupation of his cellular telephone line and cellular phone by unwelcome calls, making the phone unavailable for legitimate callers or outgoing calls while the phone was ringing from Defendant call.

35. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of unnecessary expenditure of his time. For calls he answered, the time he spent on the call was unnecessary as he repeatedly asked for the calls to stop. Even for unanswered calls, Plaintiff had to waste time to unlock the phone and deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflect the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular phone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

36. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone was an injury in the form of a nuisance and annoyance to the Plaintiff. For calls that were answered, Plaintiff had to go to the unnecessary trouble of answering them. Even for unanswered calls, Plaintiff had to waste time to unlock the phone and deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflected the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular phone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

37. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone resulted in the injury of unnecessary expenditure of Plaintiff's cell phone's battery power.

38. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone where a voice message was left which occupied space in Plaintiff's phone or network.

39. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone resulted in the injury of a trespass to Plaintiff's chattel, namely his cellular phone and his cellular phone services.

40. As a result of the calls described above, Plaintiff suffered an invasion of privacy. Plaintiff was also affect in a personal and individualized way by anxiety, frustration, and stress.

**COUNT I**  
**(Violation of the TCPA)**

41. Plaintiff fully incorporates and re-alleges paragraphs one (1) through forty (40) as if fully set forth herein.

42. Defendant willfully violated the TCPA with respect to Plaintiff, specifically for each of the auto-dialer calls made to Plaintiff's cellular telephone after Plaintiff notified Defendant that Plaintiff wished for the calls to stop

43. Defendant repeatedly placed non-emergency telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system or prerecorded or artificial voice without Plaintiff's prior express consent in violation of federal law, including 47 U.S.C § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

**[REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY]**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable and judgment against SANTANDER CONSUMER USA, INC. for statutory damages, punitive damages, actual damages, treble damages, enjoinder from further violations of these parts and any other such relief the court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ **Frank H. Kerney, III**

Frank H. Kerney, III, Esquire

BPR #: 035859

Morgan & Morgan, Tampa, P.A.

One Tampa City Center

201 North Franklin Street, Suite 700

Tampa, Florida 33602

Telephone: (813) 223-5505

Facsimile: (813) 223-5402

Noticed Email: FKerney@ForThePeople.com

Primary Email: TGomez@ForThePeople.com

Secondary Email: LDobbins@ForThePeople.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff*